

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 2 has been amended to deal with the lack of antecedent basis. Thus, the rejection of this claim and dependent claims 3-15 is now moot.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-16 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smee et al. U.S. patent No 7,082,174B1.

In rejecting claims 1 and 16, the Examiner refers to Figure 4a and suggests that the first and second filters of claim 1 and 16 may be constituted by elements 410a and 410b, and that item 420a could be considered a selector. It is submitted that 420a does not perform the function of a selector as required by claims 1 and 16. However, claims 1 and 16 have been amended to clarify the relationship between the selector and the first and second filters. In the arrangement shown in Figure 4a of Smee et al., the outputs of the filters 410a, 410b... 410k are combined at 414. It is submitted that the element 420a does not use symbol estimates from the first and second outputs as required by claims 1 and 16.

In the passages referred to in the Office Action with respect to claims 1 and 16, the first and second streams refer to a first stream which is processed by an equalizer, such a that shown in Figure 4a, and to a second stream which includes a rake receiver. This is shown, for example, in Figure 3 of Smee et al., where a switch 340 is used to select an output from the equalizer 310 or one from the rake receiver 330. The passage noted by the Examiner at column 2, lines 50-67 in fact refers to alternate arrangements for the equalizer used in the arrangement of Figure 3, that is, to the first stream only. One implementation for the first stream is that shown in Figure 4a and the second alternative for the first stream path is that shown in Figure 4b. This is clear if one refers to the paragraph at column 2, lines 36-52. The second stream is implemented using the rake receiver and does not involve initialization of space time filter coefficients by estimation of symbols, as required by claims 1 and 16.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 16 are allowable. The remaining claims are dependent either directly or indirectly on the allowable independent claims, and for this reason at least, are also allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexandr Kuzminskiy
Constantinos B. Papadias

By 

Martin I. Finston
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 31,613
(973)-386-3147

Date: Jan. 31, 2007

Docket Administrator (Room 2F-190)
Alcatel Lucent
600 Mountain Avenue
P. O. Box 636
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974-0636